

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.unpto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,878	03/29/2007	Bernd Frohlich	2051/113	8078
750 08042099 MAYER & WILLIAMS PC 251 NORTH A VENUE WEST 2ND FLOOR WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			EXAMINER	
			BRAY, STEPHEN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/04/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/565.878 FROHLICH ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit STEPHEN A. BRAY 2629 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 23 January 2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

Application/Control Number: 10/565,878 Page 2

Art Unit: 2629

Claim Objections

 Claim 1 recites the limitation "the sensors" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
 obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

 Claims 1-4, 6-9, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Armstrong (US 5,565,891) in view of Nippoldt (US 4,952,919).

Regarding claim 1, Armstrong discloses a data registration device for data processing systems, particularly for the determination of multi-dimensional coordinates

Art Unit: 2629

created by means of exertion of displacement and/or rotational forces (See abstract.), comprising

- a stand (Figure 2 discloses a housing 10.);
- a retainer element mounted in the stand such that the retainer element may be displaced in at least two mutually perpendicular directions (Figure 2 and Column 5, lines 38-52 disclose a carriage 14, which is movable left and right, forward and rearward, and up and down.);
- an operating ball that may be rotated through three axes but not displaced within the retainer element (Figure 2 discloses a trackball 12 which is mounted within carriage 14.);
- at least one sensor to determine the displacement of the retainer element and the rotation of the operating ball (Figure 2 and Column 7, lines 48-53 disclose sensors 124, 126, and 128 for determining movement of the trackball and sensors 102, 106, 108, and 114 for determining movement of the carriage 14.);
- an interface unit that transmits data delivered from the sensors to a connected data processing system (Column 11, lines 42-56 discloses having circuitry for transmitting the data collected by the sensors to a connected host device.);

Armstrong fails to teach wherein the operating ball is mounted within the retaining element such that it may be grasped on two at least partially diametrically opposed sphere segment sections, and wherein the displacement forces and the rotation forces with respect to all axes may be exerted by means of the operating ball.

Art Unit: 2629

Nippoldt discloses wherein the operating ball is mounted within the retaining element such that it may be grasped on two at least partially diametrically opposed sphere segment sections, and wherein the displacement forces and the rotation forces with respect to all axes may be exerted by means of the operating ball (Figure 1 and Column 6, lines 4-15 disclose having ball 80 of an input device 10 mounted in such a way to allow the user to grab two diametrically opposed sections 166 and 168 of the ball 80 between finger 170 and thumb 172.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to modify the input device taught by *Armstrong* with the teachings of *Nippoldt* in order to form an input device in which more precise control of the rotation of the operating ball can be achieved.

Regarding claim 2, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1, wherein the retainer element may be simultaneously displaced in the direction of several displacement axes, and wherein the operating ball may be rotated simultaneously about several axes (Figure 2 and Column 6, lines 36-41 of Armstrong disclose that carriage 14 and trackball 12 can be moved in any direction desired.).

Regarding claim 3, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1 wherein the retainer element possesses a frame-shaped ball mount that surrounds the operating ball along a great circle in a surrounded section greater than π (Figure 2, Figure 4, and Column 6, lines 27-34 of Armstrong disclose that

Art Unit: 2629

trackball 12 is placed in an opening 26, and secured in place by a collet 16, which encircles trackball 12.).

Regarding claim 4, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1 wherein the retainer element includes a key-shaped ball mount (Figure 3 and Column 3, lines 28-32 of Nippoldt disclose a ring bearing 70 which is beveled to slope downward and inward to receive and support the trackball 80.).

Regarding claim 6, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 3, wherein the retainer element includes the ball mount, an inner frame, and an outer frame, wherein the ball mount is mounted within the inner frame which itself is mounted in the outer frame such as to be displaceable along a first direction, which in turn is mounted in the stand such as to be displaceable along a second direction perpendicular to the first direction, and wherein at least one of the components of the retainer element is displaceable along a third direction that is perpendicular to the first and the second direction (Figure 2 and Column 5. lines 38-43 of Armstrong disclose that carriage 14 is displaceable in at least three directions that are perpendicular to each other, i.e. up/down, left/right, and forward/rearward. Figures 2-4 and Column 9, lines 39-47 of Armstrong disclose that carriage 14 has an opening 26 in which trackball 12 resides. Carriage 14 is mounted in track frame 34, and is moveable in a first direction, but not a second direction with respect to track frame 34. Track frame 34 is moveable in the second direction, which is perpendicular to said first direction. Track frame 34 is also moveable in the up/down direction, which is perpendicular to the first two directions.).

Art Unit: 2629

Regarding claim 7, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1, further comprising return elements that return the retainer element or its components to a rest position when no displacement force is being exerted (Figure 2 of Armstrong discloses having foam rubber 30, which is used to return carriage 14 to a rest position when no force is being exerted on the carriage 14.).

Regarding claim 8, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1, wherein displacement of the retainer element is registered by path, force, or acceleration sensors (Figure 2 and Column 6, lines 1-13 of Armstrong disclose having two-piece proximity sensor sets, i.e. actuator 100 and sensor 102, which are used to determine the direction in which carriage 14 is being displaced.).

Regarding claim 9, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1, further comprising at least two motion sensors positioned within the retainer element that register the rotation of the operating ball about three mutually-perpendicular axes (Figure 2 and Column 7, lines 11-19 of Armstrong disclose having encoders (sensors) 124, 126, 128 which detect rotation of the trackball 12. Figure 1 and Column 5, lines 1-4 of Nippoldt disclose that motion sensors 46, 48, and 50, which are preferably of an encoder-type, are used to register rotation of the ball 80.).

Regarding claim 12, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1, further comprising additional switches that transmit additional control signals to the data processing system upon actuation (Figure 1 of Nippoldt discloses a trackball device with switches 94 for transmitting additional control signals

Art Unit: 2629

upon actuation. Figure 8 of *Armstrong* also discloses an input device having switches 144 and 146.).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Armstrong (US 5,565,891) and Nippoldt (US 4,952,919) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Blonder (US 5,620,371).

Regarding claim 5, *Armstrong* as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 4.

Armstrong as modified above fails to teach a data registration device wherein the operating ball is mounted magnetically within the key-shaped ball mount, wherein the operating ball is hollow and is made of a non-magnetic material, wherein a magnetizable retaining ball is mounted within the operating ball so that it may move freely, and wherein a magnetic field source positioned outside the operating ball attracts the retaining ball into the key-shaped ball mount, and wherein the operating ball is mounted in the ball mount such so that it may rotate.

Blonder discloses a data registration device wherein the operating ball is mounted magnetically within the key-shaped ball mount, wherein the operating ball is hollow and is made of a non-magnetic material, wherein a magnetizable retaining ball is mounted within the operating ball so that it may move freely, and wherein a magnetic field source positioned outside the operating ball attracts the retaining ball into the key-shaped ball mount, and wherein the operating ball is mounted in the ball mount such so that it may rotate (Figure 4 discloses a trackball 13 which is made up of an outer sphere

Art Unit: 2629

131, which is made of plastic, and an inner sphere 132, which contains a magnet 145. The input device contains a second magnet 146 which attracts the magnet 145 located in the trackball 13, holding the inner sphere 132 in a desired position while the outer sphere 131 is able to rotate freely.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the input device taught by *Armstrong* with the teachings of *Blonder* in order to form an input device in which an advertisement or other message can be added to the trackball of the input device.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Armstrong (US 5,565,891) and Nippoldt (US 4,952,919) as applied to claim 9 above, and further in view of Bruneau et al (US 6,707,443).

Regarding claim 10, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 9.

Armstrong as modified above fails to teach a data registration device wherein the motion sensors are optical sensors that sample a surface of the operating ball and its rotation.

Bruneau et al discloses a data registration device wherein the motion sensors are optical sensors that sample a surface of the operating ball and its rotation (Column 6, lines 31-39 discloses that optical sensors are used to determine movement of a sphere 15 in a trackball input device.).

Art Unit: 2629

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made that using an optical sensing means to sense the movement of a trackball as taught by *Bruneau et al* could be substituted for the encoder sensing means to sense the movement of a trackball as taught by *Armstrong* as modified above.

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
 Armstrong (US 5,565,891) and Nippoldt (US 4,952,919) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Keyson (US 5,784,052).

Regarding claim 11, Armstrong as modified above discloses a data registration device per Claim 1.

, Armstrong as modified above fails to teach a data registration device further comprising additional actuators that oppose or reinforce a varying force in reaction to control signals from the user resulting from displacement of the retainer element or rotation of the operating ball.

Keyson discloses a data registration device further comprising additional actuators that oppose or reinforce a varying force in reaction to control signals from the user resulting from displacement of the retainer element or rotation of the operating ball (Column 5, lines 48-63 having an having an electrical DC motor which is used to apply tactile feedback to the user in response to the user moving the input device.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time that the invention was made to further modify the input device taught by *Armstrona* with

Art Unit: 2629

the teachings of *Keyson* in order to form an input device in which cursor positioning times and positioning inaccuracies are reduced significantly.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to STEPHEN A. BRAY whose telephone number is (571)270-7124. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, AMR AWAD can be reached on (571)272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 11

Application/Control Number: 10/565,878

Art Unit: 2629

Examiner, Art Unit 2629

/Amr Awad/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

28 July 2009